SINGLE BENCH 1

(1) 03

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR (CG)

WRIT PETITION NO. 1700 /2005

PETITIONER

Ashish Kumar Vaishnav, aged about 24 years, son of Shri Ram Kishore Vaishnav, village & Post Jajhpuri Kala Tahsil - Lormi, Distt. Bilaspur (C.G.)

P.R. No. 1652/05
Presented by Shri P.D. Sahu
dated 15.09.05

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. The State of Chhattisgarh, through – the Secretary, Department of School Education, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)

2. The Director, Rajeev Gandhi Shiksha Mission, Bilaspur (C.G.)

3. The Janpad Panchayat, Lormi, through – Its Chief Executive Officer, Lormi, Distt. Bilaspur (C.G.)

RECEIVED COPY
15.11.05
CLERK to A.G. BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA.

01. PARTICULARS ABOUT THE PETITIONER

XI-HC-78

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

28

मामला क्रमांक .....WP(S)...1200/2005 **सन् 200**

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

3-5-2005

Shri P.P. Sahu, counsel for the petitioner.

Shri Bhaskar Pyasi, Panel Lawyer for the State/respondents No.1 and 2.

Heard both the counsel.

The petitioner has preferred this writ petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India. The case of the petitioner is that vide resolution dated 9-1-99 (Annexure-P/1) the petitioner was selected for the post of Guruji by Gram Panchayat Boiraha and Janpat Panchayat also recommended the petitioner's appointment. In pursuance of that he was appointed on 31st March, 1999. On 30-1-2000 the petitioner was removed from the post on the ground that he is not the resident of village Boiraha. However, later on, some other person was appointed on that post mentioning therein that since no local person is available, therefore, the petitioner ought not to have been removed from the post.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner made representations, but the respondents authorities are not paying any heed to the representation. He further submitted that the petitioner may be allowed to make a detailed representation to respondent No.3 and he be directed to decide the same to which learned counsel for respondents No.1 and 2 has no objection.

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

29

मामला क्रमांक .....WPRN0..1700..1200.5 **सन् 200**

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश -2-	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

Looking to the limited request made by learned counsel for the petitioner which appears to be just and fair, the petitioner is allowed to make a detailed representation before respondent No.3 within a period of 10 days from today and in turn respondent No.3 will decide the representation of the petitioner within a period of 2 months from the date of receipt of the representation after considering all the points raised by the petitioner in an objective manner in accordance with law.

With the direction aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of.

Consequently, I.A. No.3292/2005 also stands disposed of.

Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order.

Sd/-
L.C. Bhadoo
Judge